Comparison of Distributors' Costs

Presentation to the Ontario Energy Board Consultation on Distributor Cost Comparisons September 12, 2007

Jay Shepherd, School Energy Coalition

Presentation Roadmap

Bill Comparisons

- Approach of Schools (WACS)
- Methodology
- Most and Least Expensive

Information Uses

- Board Staff Proposals
- Operational Benchmarking
- Best Practices Plans

Bill Comparisons

What Matters to Schools?

Quality of Service

- threshold issue, therefore binary
- service quality indicators an appropriate test

Efficiency of Service

- delivering quality at lowest reasonable cost for schools and other ratepayers, while maintaining reasonable returns for shareholders
- WACS weighted average cost per school

- Three model schools
 - for consistency adjusts for different school configurations in different LDCs
 - developed from sampling of actual bills
- Calculate annual bills for each
 - distribution only component, incl. losses, etc.
- Model school mix in any given area
 - developed from sampling of school boards
 - 50.76% small, 28.84% medium, 20.40% large
- Compare to provincial median

Provincial Results

Result	WACS*		
Maximum	\$15,930.41		
Minimum	\$1,572.83		
Median	\$7,563.10		

WACS Ten Least Expensive

LDC	WACS	Percent of Median
Kingston	\$3,693.29	48.83%
Welland	\$3,937.47	52.06%
Horizon	\$4,108.07	54.32%
Thunder Bay	\$4,203.83	55.58%
Markham (PS)	\$4,367.99	57.75%
Chatham-Kent	\$4,566.42	60.38%
London	\$5,583.04	73.82%
Peterborough	\$5,875.53	77.69%
Milton	\$5,924.49	78.33%
Oakville	\$6,143.63	81.23%

Cross-Referencing

• First Step in Diagnostics

check against other factors

• ROFE

- Return on financial equity
- Source OEB Yearbook
- Not identical to ROE typically 100 200 basis points lower

Residential Rates

- To identify cost allocation or rate design issues
- Source OEB website, adjusted to remove nondistribution costs

Ten Least Expensive + ROFE

LDC	WACS	% of Median	ROFE
Kingston	\$3,693.29	48.83%	7.05%
Welland	\$3,937.47	52.06%	13.64%
Horizon	\$4,108.07	54.32%	10.19%
Thunder Bay	\$4,203.83	55.58%	1.41%
Markham (PS)	\$4,367.99	57.75%	10.14%*
Chatham-Kent	\$4,566.42	60.38%	7.62%
London	\$5,583.04	73.82%	4.57%
Peterborough	\$5,875.53	77.69%	8.02%
Milton	\$5,924.49	78.33%	7.88%
Oakville	\$6,143.63	81.23%	6.37%

Ten Least Expensive + Res.

LDC	WACS	% of Med.	ROFE	Res. Bill	% of Med.
Kingston	\$3,693.29	48.83%	7.05%	\$372.90	91.07%
Welland	\$3,937.47	52.06%	13.64%	\$405.81	99.10%
Horizon	\$4,108.07	54.32%	10.19%	\$398.58	97.54%
Thunder Bay	\$4,203.83	55.58%	1.41%	\$356.10	86.96%
Markham (PS)	\$4,367.99	57.75%	10.14%*	\$332.91	81.30%
Chatham-Kent	\$4,566.42	60.38%	7.62%	\$402.72	98.35%
London	\$5,583.04	73.82%	4.57%	\$402.62	98.32%
Peterborough	\$5,875.53	77.69%	8.02%	\$363.51	88.77%
Milton	\$5,924.49	78.33%	7.88%	\$404.82	98.86%
Oakville	\$6,143.63	81.23%	6.37%	\$447.07	109.18%

WACS Ten Most Expensive

LDC	WACS	Percent of Median	
Newmarket	\$10,143.35	134.12%	
Toronto	\$10,120.49	133.81%	
Sudbury	\$10,094.54	133.47%	
Haldimand	\$9,744.17	128.84%	
Whitby	\$9,546.71	126.23%	
Sault Ste. Marie (PUC)	\$9,406.99	124.38%	
Mississauga (EHM)	\$9,227.96	122.01%	
Aurora (PS)	\$8,984.01	118.79%	
Ottawa	\$8,098.90	107.08%	

WACS Ten Most Expensive

LDC	WACS	Percent of Median
Hydro One (Core)*	\$17,471.92	231.02%
Newmarket	\$10,143.35	134.12%
Toronto	\$10,120.49	133.81%
Sudbury	\$10,094.54	133.47%
Haldimand	\$9,744.17	128.84%
Whitby	\$9,546.71	126.23%
Sault Ste. Marie (PUC)	\$9,406.99	124.38%
Mississauga (EHM)	\$9,227.96	122.01%
Aurora (PS)	\$8,984.01	118.79%
Ottawa	\$8,098.90	107.08%

Ten Most Expensive + ROFE

LDC	WACS	% of Median	ROFE
Hydro One (Core)*	\$17,471.92	231.02%	8.41%
Newmarket	\$10,143.35	134.12%	10.39%*
Toronto	\$10,120.49	133.81%	11.08%
Sudbury	\$10,094.54	133.47%	8.01%
Haldimand	\$9,744.17	128.84%	6.47%
Whitby	\$9,546.71	126.23%	5.26%
Sault Ste. Marie (PUC)	\$9,406.99	124.38%	(9.49%)
Mississauga (EHM)	\$9,227.96	122.01%	7.28%
Aurora (PS)	\$8,984.01	118.79%	8.02%*
Ottawa	\$8,098.90	107.08%	18.13%

Ten Most Expensive + Res.

LDC	WACS	% of Med.	ROFE	Res. Bill	% of Med.
Hydro One (Core)*	\$17,471.92	231.02%	8.41%	\$636.45	155.43%
Newmarket	\$10,143.35	134.12%	10.39%*	\$402.56	98.31%
Toronto	\$10,120.49	133.81%	11.08%	\$431.80	105.45%
Sudbury	\$10,094.54	133.47%	8.01%	\$394.79	96.41%
Haldimand	\$9,744.17	128.84%	6.47%	\$596.82	145.75%
Whitby	\$9,546.71	126.23%	5.26%	\$473.04	115.52%
Sault Ste. Marie (PUC)	\$9,406.99	124.38%	(9.49%)	\$303.54	74.13%
Mississauga (EHM)	\$9,227.96	122.01%	7.28%	\$371.22	90.65%
Aurora (PS)	\$8,984.01	118.79%	8.02%*	\$537.06	131.15%
Ottawa	\$8,098.90	107.08%	18.13%	\$396.65	96.87%

Information Uses

Uses of the Information Menu of Options

- Operational Comparisons within Utility
 - Already common practice
- Screening by Board Staff
 - Deployment of resources (intervenors as well)
 - Allocation to regulatory method or type of hearing
- Aspect of X-Factor Calculation
 - Component of the formula
 - Factor in judgmental adjustment

Uses of the Information Schools' Proposal

1. Pre-Rebasing

- Judgment-based X-factor component

2. First Rebasing (2G IRM)

- Performance Improvement Plan
- Target Frontier Pricing

3. Second Rebasing (3G IRM)

- Assessment against plan
- Mandatory budget cuts if warranted
- Revised/Updated Performance Improvement Plan

Comparison of Distributors' Costs

Presentation to the Ontario Energy Board Consultation on Distributor Cost Comparisons September 12, 2007

Jay Shepherd, School Energy Coalition